



**Arizona Juvenile Justice Commission
Governor's Office of Youth, Faith and Family**

1700 West Washington Street, Suite 230, PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007

A general meeting of the Arizona Juvenile Justice Commission (AJJC) was convened on September 6, 2018, at the Governor's Office of Youth, Faith and Family, 1700 West Washington Street, Suite 200, Phoenix, Arizona 85007, notice having been duly given.

Members Present (20)	
Cindi Nannetti, Chair	James Molina
Helen Gándara	Navin Crump
James Beene	Alice Bustillo
Debra Olson	Donald Walker
Dorothy Wodraska	Earl Newton
Gregory McKay	Jane Kallal
Jeffery Hood	Joseph Grossman
Joseph Kelroy	Mindy Flannery
Shawn Cox	Shaun Rieve
Heather Carter	Maria Dodge
Staff/Guests Present (19)	Members Absent (10)
Maria Fuentes, Director, GOYFF	Christina Schopen
Malcolm Hightower, Deputy Director, GOYFF	Vada Phelps
Wendi Malmgren, Americorps VISTA, GOYFF	Jason Holmberg
Steve Selover, Program Administrator, GOYFF	Guadalupe Durazo
Sue Micetic, Americorps VISTA, GOYFF	Tom Callahan
Alfreda Moore, Program Administrator, GOYFF	Robert Brutinel
Rebecca Chelsey, Program Administrator, GOYFF	Jose Gonzales
Leona Morales, Program Administrator, GOYFF	Dennis Pickering
Sara Lamog, Americorps VISTA, GOYFF	Leslie Quinn
Janice Garza, Americorps VISTA, GOTR	Robert Thomas
Livia Finman, MSW Intern, GOYFF	
Geri Yrigolla, Lead Probation Officer-ACES, PCJCC	
Damian Vaughn, PCJCC	
Natasha Avila, PCJCC	
John Crabtree, Interstate Commission on Juveniles, ADJC	
Jeff Dinges, Public Member	
Dale Vecker, Public Member	
Tyler Howard, Public Member	
Joseph Ward, Public Member	
Boushon M. Arnold, Public Member	

Call to Order

- **Ms. Cindi Nannetti**, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:34 a.m. with 20 members and 19 staff and guests present.

Introductions

- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, asked members to introduce themselves.
- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, recognized new member, Maria Dodge.

Approval of Minutes

- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, requested a review of the March 22, 2018 meeting minutes.
 - **Mr. Joseph Kelroy** motioned to accept the minutes as stated.
 - **Ms. Dorothy Wodraska** seconded the motion.
- The motion passed with no dissenting votes.

Welcome and GOYFF Updates

- **Ms. Maria Fuentes**, Governor's Office of Youth, Faith and Family (GOYFF) Director, provided a brief update on the office work and events, including the Lighting Arizona Purple event scheduled for October 2, and she introduced Deputy Director **Malcolm Hightower** and Program Administrator **Rebecca Chesley**.
- **Ms. Fuentes** advised that GOYFF is prioritizing efforts to address adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) and trauma-informed awareness care.

Trauma-Informed Approaches to Juvenile Justice

- **Ms. Sue Micetic**, Americorps Vista and doctoral candidate at Arizona State University, provided a presentation on the link between trauma and delinquency.
- **Ms. Micetic's** presentation outlined research that demonstrates the impact of trauma on a child's brain and how exposure to ACEs can make a youth more vulnerable to violence and crime.
- **Ms. Micetic** advised that due to the under-developed adolescent brain, youth often have less self-control, which is a primary cause of juvenile crime.
- **Ms. Micetic** referred to research studies that have affirmed the prevalence of trauma in delinquent youth.
- **Ms. Micetic** ended her presentation by citing examples of trauma-informed approaches used to address delinquency.
- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, asked for more information regarding the ACEs event hosted by GOYFF and advised everyone to attend if they can. **Ms. Micetic** provided the date of the event and stated that invitations will be sent out soon.
- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, brought attention to the Pathways to Desistance Study ("the Pathways Study"), which had been mentioned during the presentation. She asked if study subjects had been juveniles only or if adults had been included. **Ms. Micetic** clarified study subjects were identified between 2000 and 2003, and were then followed over a period of seven years. **Ms. Micetic** stated all subjects started as juveniles and some aged out over the course of the study.
- **Ms. Micetic** informed the commission all study materials are available online, recommending the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Juvenile Justice Fact Sheet.
- **Judge James Beene** asked for clarification on language included in the Pathways Study slide that proposed detention may not always be the most appropriate or effective option for the most serious adolescent offenders. **Judge Beene** shared he had to consider the needs of victims and the community, when he was a juvenile court judge trying violent offenders. He asked if the study included suggestions or alternative responses for others who are tasked with making similar decisions. **Ms. Micetic** emphasized the study cited in the presentation focused on first-time offenders, evaluating five behaviors which have been shown to indicate risk for potential future involvement in the juvenile justice system. She recalled, in some cases, placement in a therapeutic group home has shown to be effective. She wondered aloud if house

arrest may be a viable option. She added that she understands the concerns of releasing violent offenders into the community who are at risk for reoffending.

- **Mr. Greg McKay** stated he is concerned about the use of the foster care system as an alternative to juvenile detention and noted that one study recommended alternative housing for youth at risk for detention or placement due to the absence of an available home. He cautioned utilizing licensed foster homes or group homes as default placements, pointing out they are not secure or equipped to provide a level of care that is a “step down” from incarceration.
- **Mr. James Molina** agreed with the need to come up with alternatives to foster care group homes where youth who have abuse history are integrated with youth who do not.
- **Ms. Maria Dodge** stated her belief that foster care youth and delinquent youth are largely the same population, rather than two separate groups, noting that both groups have the highest incidents of trauma. She added that some group home staff addresses aggression between residents by involving law enforcement, compared to families who may address the same incident without involving the police.
- **Ms. Micetic** asked members to reference the Georgetown Study for an example of the Crossover Youth Practice Model.
- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, stated that it is ideal for judges to have more options for youth offenders.
- **Mr. Kelroy** stated that his department is currently in collaboration with Georgetown University to develop and establish the Crossover Youth Practice Model in Arizona.

Regionalization and HB 2259

- **Mr. Kelroy**, Juvenile Justice Services Division Director at the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), presented on the Detention Regionalization Task Force recommendations. He stated the task force was created by the Chief Justice to address current detention space utilization and cost, viability for regional detention centers, options for repurposing unused space and any other options to achieve this goal.
- **Mr. Kelroy** provided background on the reduced number of juveniles involved in the juvenile justice system, which has led to a decreased number of youth detained in county juvenile detention facilities. He advised that Pinal County currently has intergovernmental agreements (IGAs) with Apache, Navajo, Gila, Graham and Greenlee counties. He added that La Paz County has an IGA established with Yuma and Mohave Counties.
- **Mr. Kelroy** stated that the Juvenile Justice Services Division reported the task force recommendations to the Arizona Judicial Council in October, 2017. The recommendations were included in the AJJC commission packets.
- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, asked whether juveniles are still seen at a detention hearing in their own county, even if they are detained in a facility outside their home county. **Mr. Kelroy** affirmed they usually do appear in person for their first hearing. They can also appear electronically for subsequent hearings.
- **Ms. Dodge** asked how juveniles appearing electronically are able to privately confer with their attorney. **Mr. Kelroy** advised that they would need to pause the hearing so both parties could step out and communicate telephonically.
- **Mr. Kelroy** explained that there are currently HOPE Centers established in three counties that provide 23 hour respite care for juveniles who need a “cooling off” period. Services are often provided to the youth and family as well. He added that Yuma and Yavapai counties have “transition schools”.
- **Mr. Joseph Grossman** asked **Mr. Kelroy** to provide additional information on the Detention Screening Instrument (DSI). **Mr. Kelroy** advised the assessment is used prior to the youth’s hearing to determine whether the youth is at risk for reoffending or not appearing for court. **Mr. Kelroy** also responded that the tool is not included in the task force report.
- **Mr. Grossman** asked if the utilization of DSIs was similar to the work being done by the (Laura and John) Arnold Foundation. **Mr. Kelroy** affirmed the pathway for juveniles and adults is the same. He went on to explain, previously, screening tools were used by law enforcement; however, there was inconsistency between offices. He stated the DSI currently in development is in the process of being validated.
- **Mr. Grossman** asked how the data collected by the DSI is scored, providing the example of juveniles being assigned a risk number. **Mr. Kelroy** shared adult DSIs ask six questions, while the juvenile DSI is two sides

of a page. He stated it evaluates whether the juvenile should be placed in a remand alternative or released. He clarified that in the adult system, the prosecution is consulted to make these kinds of decisions. In the juvenile system, using a DSI, the officer is able to make the decision independently.

- **Mr. Grossman** asked where discretion exists. **Mr. Kelroy** specified discretion is with the detention officer, to determine if the juvenile will reoffend or return to court. He clarified the instrument assesses threat to public safety
- **Ms. Wodraska** referred to ARS 15-913 (education for detained youth) stating that this statute needs to be updated in light of the recent changes.
- **Mr. McKay** asked whether other options are offered prior to a youth enters foster care. **Mr. Kelroy** responded that adequate alternatives are likely the most challenging barrier. He stated that they are working with Georgetown University to look at risks and available providers.
- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, asked whether visitation is addressed for youth detained outside their community. **Mr. Kelroy** that this is conducted via PolyCom and that the average stay in detention is just 17 days.
- **Mr. Kelroy** informed the council there are eight clinics operating out of probation offices, providing community referrals and medical screenings. He also shared some medical services provided occur through Tele-med and Tele-counseling.
- **Ms. Dodge** asked whether visitation is required. **Mr. Kelroy** stated Telecom phone calls are required to be provided. **Ms. Dodge** and **Mr. Kelroy** agreed parents often do not visit their children while they are in custody; they confirmed Telecom must be provided to those who want to utilize it.
- **Mr. McKay** commented that violent offenders have no middle ground and that they end up on the foster care system. He provided the example of a juvenile who removed his ankle bracelet, which led the youth to be referred to the Department of Child Safety as the result of the child's parent not possessing the ability to ensure compliance. **Mr. Kelroy** expressed the need to review these cases that involve violent offenders as they are being set up for failure when placed in the foster care system.
- **Ms. Nannetti** asked if there is adequate space for juveniles in regional detention centers. She asked for confirmation that all counties do have access to juvenile facilities. **Mr. Kelroy** affirmed that all counties have access to juvenile detention and explained both La Paz and Greenlee counties have always held contracts with other counties, because their juvenile populations are smaller.

The ACES Center

- **Ms. Geri Yrigolla**, Lead Probation Officer from the Pima County Juvenile Court Center, presented on the Alternative Community Engagement Services (ACES) Center.
- **Ms. Yrigolla** stated the center, which officially opened three years ago, is funded by the Title II Juvenile Justice grant administered by GOYFF.
- **Ms. Yrigolla** advised the center is an unlocked facility open 24 hours per day, seven days per week. She stated the local law enforcement values the program as they are often able to drop off a child that does not qualify for detention. The process for police is much quicker than screening a youth for detention, allowing the officer to be back on the street in approximately five minutes.
- **Ms. Yrigolla** advised that the center serves youth 8–17 and that youth and parent surveys are conducted after discharge.
- **Mr. Navin Crump** asked how people are made aware of the location of the facility. **Ms. Yrigolla** stated that they are continuing to work on outreach and added that they have conducted school presentations, used media, newsletters, flyers for law enforcement and school resource officers to promote the center. She emphasized service providers in the community are most aware; however, she stated some referrals come from families who recommend their services to friends and other community members.
- **Ms. Nannetti** asked if school resource officers are aware of the program. **Ms. Yrigolla** stated several referrals have come from resource officers on issues regarding sibling conflict and parent-child conflict. She shared the program functions as a cool down center for status offenses and misdemeanor domestic violence offenses. She shared the program is able to supervise children being held for DCS, until placement is identified.

Interstate Commission for Juveniles Report

- **Mr. John Crabtree** provided a report from the Interstate Commission for Juveniles (ICJ) on the status of the interstate compact for juveniles in Arizona.
- **Mr. Crabtree** explained the extradition costs. He stated that 82 cases of extradition have been resolved, including incoming from outside the state, those from Arizona going out of state, and those with no status.
- **Mr. Crabtree** advised seven cases are currently pending or unresolved.
- **Mr. Crabtree** offered to provide training on the work of the ICJ to any interested commission members.

Planning Meeting Report

- **Mr. Steve Selover** referenced the report from the planning meeting, which took place March 22, 2018, and stated that the report contains meeting materials and an overview of the discussion that took place. In addition, the report contains recommendations by the facilitators to address the expressed needs of the commission. **Mr. Selover** advised that the report will serve as guidance for future efforts developed over the next three years.

AJJC Committee Reports

- **Children's Justice Committee**
 - **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, advised that the committee is planning a one-day training for the children's justice coordinators, funded by the Children's Justice Grant, and their supervisors to train them on multi-disciplinary team protocols, mandatory reporting training, and information on additional training available for their collaborators.
 - **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, added that advocacy centers around that state that do not employ a children's justice coordinator will also be invited so that this information can be shared to a wider audience, and to promote children's justice grant opportunities that these providers may not be aware of.
- **DMC Committee**
 - **Ms. Helen Gándara** reported that the committee met to discuss potential membership that would help the committee with its mission to monitor and support statewide efforts that address disproportionate minority contact (DMC).
 - **Ms. Gándara** added that the committee wishes to serve an advisory role for efforts that are occurring throughout the state rather than duplicating efforts by other statewide initiatives, such as the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI).
- **Grants Committee**
 - **Ms. Wodraska** stated the Grants Committee had its first meeting in August and advised it is overseeing the Title II grant review process. **Ms. Wodraska** advised that it will determine the strongest applications by the end of September.
 - **Ms. Wodraska** also noted the committee will oversee the awarded programs throughout the grant cycle, monitoring performance and compliance with requirements.
 - **Ms. Nannetti** added that the committee may schedule site visits with programs when needed to meet with funded organizations in person. **Ms. Nannetti** encouraged members to join the committee if interested.

Call to the Public

- Public Member **Mr. Jeff Dinges**, Agriculture Instructor and Future Farmers of America advisor at Mayer High School explained how his program impacts youth in the community.
- **Mr. Dinges** described the welding program and its use for helping at-risk youth as it provides a skill that these students can use for a high-paying career.
- **Representative Heather Carter** advised she is meeting with the Phoenix Police later today to discuss information sharing with school. She assured she will keep the commission informed on any developments.
- **Mr. McKay** encouraged members to review ARS 13-3613 noting that contributing to the dependency of a child is a class 1 misdemeanor.

Adjournment

- **Ms. Nannetti**, Chair, called for a motion to adjourn.
 - **Mr. Grossman** moved to adjourn the meeting
 - **Ms. Shawn Cox** seconded the motion.
- Motion carried without dissent. Meeting adjourned at 11:45 PM.

Dated September 11, 2018
Arizona Juvenile Justice Commission
Submitted by Steve Selover
Program Administrator, GOYFF